



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/537,751	06/06/2005	John Watler Englert	PU020491	5463
24498	7590	05/16/2008		
Joseph J. Laks			EXAMINER	
Thomson Licensing LLC			DESTR, JEAN WICEL	
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				
PO Box 5312			ART UNIT	
PRINCETON, NJ 08543			2622	
			MAIL DATE	
			05/16/2008	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/537,751

Applicant(s)

ENGLERT, JOHN WATLER

Examiner

Jean W. Désir

Art Unit

2622

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/9/07

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 18, 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5,313,282) in view of Kim et al (GB 2 286 712 A).

Claim 18:

Hayashi discloses:

"applying power (see item 21 of Fig. 1) to a first tuner (items 10, 2 of Fig. 1) and a second tuner (items 22, 12 of Fig. 1) in a first mode of operation", see also col. 2 lines 32-34, col. 4 lines 41-43;

"removing power from said first tuner in a second mode ~~more~~ of operation", see col. 6 lines 59-61;

"applying power to cyclically apply and remove power to said second tuner during said second mode of operation, wherein power is applied to said second tuner said second tuner during a portion of said second mode of operation and removing power from said second tuner during the remainder of said second mode of operation, wherein said portion of said second mode of operation is less than 100 percent of the time duration of said second mode of operation", see col. 6 lines 39-68;

the difference between the claimed invention and Hayashi's disclosure is that Hayashi does not explicitly teach **cyclically** apply and remove power to the second tuner. However, Hayashi does teach apply and remove power to the tuner as pointed out above; and the reference to Kim shows it is notoriously well known in the art to **cyclically (periodically)** apply and remove power to a tuner (as evidence see Kim at the Abstract paragraph (57), specifically lines 5-10, at Fig. 2 items 24, 29, and at Fig. 3) in order, inter alia, to reduce power consumption; because of these teachings an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, the combination would advantageously provide a system that would reduce power consumption. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 18; in the above combination, Hayashi's disclosure is applicable to television signal (see col. 1 lines 8-12).

3. Claims 19-22, 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hayashi (US 5,313,282) in view of Kim et al (GB 2 286 712 A) and further in view of Shimakawa et al (US 6,452,644).

Claim 19:

The above combination discloses all the limitations of claim 19, except "to facilitate the reception of auxiliary data" as claimed in claim 19. However, regarding this exception, Shimakawa shows it is notoriously well known in the art for a device to facilitate the reception of auxiliary data and reduce power consumption (as evidence

see Shimakawa at col. 8 lines 26-31, col. 6 lines 15-16); because of these teachings an artisan would be motivated to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention, the combination would advantageously provide a system that would facilitate the reception of auxiliary data and reduce power consumption. Therefore, the claimed invention would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claim 20 is disclosed, see Shimakawa at col. 8 lines 26-27, col. 6 lines 15-16.

Claim 21 is disclosed, see Shimakawa at col. 1 lines 40-41.

(NOTE: claim 21 is considered as being depended on claim 19, instead of 18 as claimed, appropriate correction is required).

Claim 22 is disclosed, see Shimakawa at col. 8 lines 26-27, col. 6 lines 15-16.

Claims 2-4 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 19-21.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection necessitated by the amendment.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean W. Désir whose telephone number is (571) 272 7344. The examiner can normally be reached on 5/4/9 - First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz can be reached on (571) 272 7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/David L. Ometz/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622

Application/Control Number: 10/537,751

Page 6

Art Unit: 2622

JWD

May. 16, 08